

FY02 SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL AWARDS

GUIDANCE FOR ARMY NOMINATIONS

CONTENTS

1. AWARD CATEGORIES BY FISCAL YEAR	2
2. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS	
2.1 MACOM/REGION NOMINATION REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS. .	2
2.2 SUBMISSION FORMATS	3
2.3 NOMINATION DUE DATES AND ADDRESSES	3
2.4 NOMINATION SUMMARY SHEET	4
2.5 JUDGING CRITERIA	4
2.6 QUESTIONS	4
3. TIPS FOR DEVELOPING SUCCESSFUL NOMINATION PACKAGES	4
4. PROCEDURES FOR FY02 – ISSUED JULY 2002	6

1. AWARD CATEGORIES BY FISCAL YEAR

Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) made official announcement in July, 2000, of revised Defense Environmental Security Awards. Army adopted these revisions for use with the Secretary of the Army (SECARMY) Environmental Awards. Defense and Army awards now include the following in a repeating two-year cycle.

FY 2001	FY 2002 (CURRENT CYCLE)
Installation/Civil Works Facility	Installation/Civil Works Facility
• Natural Resources Conservation, Small	• Natural Resources Conservation, Large
• Cultural Resources Management	• Cultural Resources Management
• Environmental Quality, Non-Industrial	• Environmental Quality, Industrial
	• Environmental Quality Overseas
• Pollution Prevention, Industrial	• Pollution Prevention, Non-Industrial
• Environmental Restoration	• Environmental Restoration
Team/Individual	Team/Individual
• Environmental Excellence in Weapon System Acquisition (<u>Team only</u>)	• Cultural Resources Management
• Natural Resources Conservation	• Pollution Prevention
• Environmental Quality	
• Environmental Restoration	

2. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

2.1 MACOM/REGION NOMINATION REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS. Each Major Army Command (MACOM) and Installation Management Agency (IMA) Region/Directorate may submit one nominee in each category/subcategory

- Winners from the last prior year in which an award [sub]category was given may not compete in the same [sub]category during the FY02 award cycle. For example, a FY01 Cultural Resources Management, Installation, winner may not compete in the same [sub]category in FY02; a winner for FY00 Natural Resources Conservation, Large Installation, may not compete in the same [sub]category in FY02. On the other hand, an installation may submit a team or individual nomination in the same category in which they won an installation award, and vice versa.

- Natural and Cultural Resources awards are based on achievements made during the preceding three fiscal years, inclusive of the award fiscal year. Environmental Quality, Pollution Prevention, and Environmental Restoration Awards are based on achievements during the preceding two fiscal years, inclusive of the award fiscal year.
- Nominations for teams should name specific individuals and should not be used in lieu of nomination for an installation award. With the exception of small staffs (such as smaller Reserve & National Guard facilities, Civil Works Facilities, or government staff at a Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated facility), an entire environmental department should normally not be submitted as a team.
- Nominees for individual awards may not be contract or contractor employees. Nominees for teams must include at least one government employee, military or civilian.

Nomination content guidance for each award category is provided via the DoD guidance, enclosure 3 to the basic memorandum.

2.2 SUBMISSION FORMATS. MACOM/Region nomination packages and the nominee summary form (see paragraph 2.4) for each are to be submitted in electronic form. Microsoft Word format is preferred for Army competition submission. However, other formats may be acceptable provided they are coordinated in advance. If sending as an electronic mail attachment is problematical for any reason, a 3 1/2-inch computer disc, zip disk, or CD-ROM may be used. Each nomination shall consist of single-spaced text and may use tables to demonstrate program accomplishments. The Army winner in each category will have an opportunity to add additional graphics such as charts, diagrams, photographs, or maps, to further demonstrate excellence prior to submission for DoD competition. Nomination packages will not contain videos or music. The text of nominations is no longer restricted to a particular word count. However, narrative font must be 12-point or larger. The total text and tables of each nomination for Army competition shall consist of no more than 7 pages (single-sided) when printed. The Army winner in each category will be able to expand their package to 10 pages for DoD competition. All other Defense Environmental Security Award format requirements will also apply, except that .PDF files are not required for the Army submission. Army winners will be required to submit both Word and .PDF versions to Army to support Army's final submission to DoD.

2.3 NOMINATION DUE DATES AND ADDRESSES. Nominations will be due to the email or shipment address(es) below by close of business on 15 Nov 02.¹

¹ MACOMs/Regions anticipating a request for an extension should coordinate immediately with USAEC POCs -- alternate or duplicate addresses may be required. In all cases nominations must be delivered in time for incorporation into Army judges' "notebooks" prior to shipment to the judges. POC telephone numbers: Mr. Ricci, DSN 584-1234 or Commercial 410 436-1234; Ms. Johnson, DSN 584-1653 or Commercial 410 436-1653.

Electronic mail (preferred): *Joseph.Ricci@aec.apgea.army.mil* and *Daniele.Johnson@aec.apgea.army.mil*. MACOMs/Regions should ensure both addresses are included on the electronic transmission.

Computer disc:

Regular Mail: U.S. Army Environmental Center
ATTN: SFIM-AEC-IO (J. Ricci)
5179 Hoadley Road
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5401

Express/Courier: U.S. Army Environmental Center
ATTN: SFIM-AEC-IO (J. Ricci)]
Beal Road, Building E4460
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5401
Telephone (410) 436-1234

2.4 NOMINATION SUMMARY SHEET. All nominations must be accompanied by a summary sheet (enclosure 2 to the basic memorandum) which provides nomination information and points of contact. In addition, each summary sheet includes the requirement for a nomination summary (up to six numbered sentences) identifying the nominee's most significant program successes described in the nomination, using quantitative examples, suitable to print in the awards ceremony handout and be read (for winners) during the awards ceremony

2.5 JUDGING CRITERIA. Judging criteria that will be used in the Army selection process are those of the DoD awards guidance (enclosure 3 to the basic memorandum).

2.6 QUESTIONS. Potential or actual nominees with questions should communicate through their MACOM/Region POCs, rather than directly with USAEC, to the greatest extent possible.

2.7 TIPS FOR DEVELOPING SUCCESSFUL NOMINATION PACKAGES.

- **Check the DoD format guidance and judging criteria against your nomination. Make sure if you left something out, you intended to do so. You don't need headings for every topic, necessarily; just make sure you cover what is indicated. Make it easy for the judges to evaluate your nomination against the judging criteria.**
- On the other hand, sometimes it is easy to write long, complicated sentences as you try to describe your program without leaving anything out. Concise narration written in an active voice will tell your story better than twice as much text in a rambling style or passive voice. Review your text for sentence length,

too. A mix of short and medium-length sentences is easier to read than one long sentence after another.

- **Request assistance from your Public Affairs Office or technical writer resources to help write and/or edit your nomination packages. (At the very least, have more than one person edit your draft narration.) PAO staff can also help you select appropriate graphics. Since PAO will assist you with local and even regional publicity, getting them involved early is a great idea regardless of how you place in the competition.²**
- **Use appropriate quantitative data to support your successes. Use tables, charts, and graphs to visually emphasize your numerical and/or percentage improvements.**
- **Be sure to identify the unique or unusual challenges your program faces due to location, installation mission, or other constraints. Tell how you planned, organized and accomplished your successes in dealing with those challenges. The installations, individuals, and teams that successfully face the greatest challenges have the opportunity to produce the most competitive nomination packages.**
- Photographs can be extremely important in drawing attention to your outstanding accomplishments or illustrating those challenges.
- Regarding formats:
 - Use the DoD format guidance and judging criteria in developing your document outline.
 - Be consistent in the styles of headings and subheadings – when each level of detail has a consistent format, readers can easily find interesting or important sections of text.
 - Left justified text is normally easier to read than left/right justified text.
 - Use italics to highlight or emphasize text, not for full paragraphs.
 - Bulletized lists help highlight key program features. A program summary near the beginning of your narration can provide a consolidated view of your greatest successes.
 - Fact boxes (e.g., acreages for various land types) provide visual interest and convey the information better than lists built into sentences. Text boxes using differing colors and fonts can highlight key features of your program without disturbing narrative flow. They're an especially good way to highlight quotes from VIPs about the successes of your program.

² Here's a relevant comment from a former installation PAO: "Getting the installation PAO/writing staff involved would add to the possibility of getting better (or more) local publicity. I know that I sometimes was unaware of a success unless or until some project manager came to me and asked for assistance in writing an awards package."

Procedures for FY02 Army Environmental Awards - July 2002

The following procedures address changes in the Army Environmental Awards Program as a result of TIM implementation. Guidance and procedures not affected by TIM implementation will be provided in a separate document. These procedures, therefore, are not intended to be all-inclusive. They are primarily provided to address many questions this Center has been receiving regarding impacts of TIM implementation on the Army Environmental Awards Program.

There will be eight award categories this year:
Natural Resources Conservation, Large Installation
Cultural Resources Management Installation
Cultural Resources Management Individual/Team
Environmental Quality Industrial Installation
Environmental Quality Overseas Installation
Pollution Prevention Non-Industrial Installation
Pollution Prevention Individual/Team
Environmental Restoration Installation

At this point, we anticipate that the actual guidance for each award will deviate very little, if at all, from past years. For planning purposes, review the guidance issued two years ago for these awards. We strongly suggest that installations start developing their packages now based on this guidance. We expect this will not be a wasted effort.

USAEC will coordinate and administer the judging process for the FY02 Army Environmental Awards. All nominations will be sent to AEC who will ensure each nomination gets to the proper judging panel. MACOMs (to include the National Guard, and HQUSACE) will send their nominees directly to AEC. All Regions and the Reserve Directorate will send their nominees through the Installation Management Agency (IMA) to AEC.

The IMA Regions, the Army National Guard, and Reserve Directorate may each submit one nomination for each of the eight award categories, as applicable. The nominees submitted by an IMA region will represent a garrison from within that respective region.

A "tenant" organization at an installation that elects to submit a nomination will do so to their respective MACOM. Each MACOM may submit one nomination for each of the eight categories. As an example, an ATEC tenant at an installation will submit their nomination to ATEC for further consideration. A unit pertaining to the Corps of Engineers Military Programs will submit their nomination to HQUSACE through their proper command channels.

Each Region and MACOM will designate an Awards POC.

Regions and Commands will be responsible for ensuring their nominees DO NOT have any active Notices of Violation or enforcement actions in the category for which they are being nominated.

In order to allow some time for the Regions to become operational, the deadline for receipt of nominations at USAEC will be 15 November. Judging panels will convene in early December, and recommended winners sent to the Pentagon shortly thereafter for approval. We currently project beginning work on the Army winning nominations by 15 January. Based on last years DoD submission deadline of 1 Mar, this would give 1 ½ months to work on preparing nomination packages for DoD competition.

AEC will work with the Regions and MACOMs on a case-by-case basis regarding the submission deadlines. However, it must be recognized that Army winners feed into the DoD competition. Therefore, we must operate within DoD's schedule constraints, and likely cannot extend the Army competition to be as long as some may desire.

Here are some conclusions and recommendations drawn from a review of past DoD winning packages. Although there are no guarantees, we feel using these pointers during package development will make for some very strong nominations.

Primary Features of Winning Nominations

Adherence to DoD Criteria: The judges seem to give high points for those accomplishments that relate directly to the primary criteria in the DoD Judging Guidance: program management, technical merit, orientation to mission, transferability, community involvement, and program breadth. Although an installation can enhance its nomination by using graphics to support text or improving the way text is presented, these factors will not guarantee a DoD-level winner to the degree that adhering to the DoD criteria will. One DoD winner was noticeably unable to fulfill all of the criteria, but the submission addressed all of it and gave logical reasons why they weren't. Other nominations failed to address all criteria adequately and still won. In general, their Army counterparts had also failed to address all criteria adequately, and the winner tended to be stronger in the areas that they did address.

Statement of Formidable Challenges Juxtaposed with Innovative Approaches: The DoD-level winners overwhelmingly were able to present formidable challenges—seemingly insurmountable obstacles that, by their nature, required unprecedented innovation and ingenuity on the part of the environmental programs. The DoD-level winners presented programs that were forced to go “above and beyond” what is expected of an environmental program. To do so, the programs used innovative management and technology; in doing this, they set precedents and tested prototypes, the success of which often earned points for transferability of approaches, in addition to program management and technical merit. Another “above and beyond” approach was to reach out to the community and other outside institutions in partnerships; this alternative method of reaching

goals would of course gain points in the DoD category of community involvement.

Some nominations presented their challenges up front, and used the rest of the submission to show the ways that an installation met the overarching challenges. Others did an effective job of coupling nearly every action or accomplishment with a challenge to be met. Both approaches were effective because they directly linked their actions with a challenge. In addition, the more staggering the challenge, the greater the impetus to “think outside the box” and approach problems in new and different ways. In general, the DoD-level winners painted a clear picture of individuals and programs that responded to formidable challenges in creative ways that involved partnerships, saved money, and achieved positive results in a short time.

Featured Initiatives and Actions that Occurred during the Award Period: The winning submissions gave a real sense that their nominees were “programs and people of action.” It wasn’t enough just to be a solid program that consistently remained in compliance through sound program management; the winning programs were those who regularly initiated action—whether starting a program, organizing a volunteer effort, or making a real change in the old way of doing things. The winners often were the first in their military branch—or the first in the DoD—to adopt a particular method. They were the proactive ones, the doers who always had long-term effects in mind.

The winning nominations emphasized this in two ways. First, and perhaps most importantly, they made it clear throughout a nomination that the actions and accomplishments had occurred *during the award period*. Some of the Army nominees featured several “old” or “ongoing” accomplishments—ones that continued to have benefits during the award period but that had been initiated prior to it. Our observations of the winners show programs that consistently initiated actions *and* saw results within the two- or three-year period for the awards.

Secondly, the winning nominations used a wealth of “action” words to show that they had been active during the award period. One package, for example, refers to “providing,” “establishing,” “developing,” “chartering,” and “implementing.” Another winner “championed” efforts, “supervises” others, “demonstrated” underfunding and “secured” funding, “devised” interim actions, and “successfully advocated” for use of an alternative technology. The Army nominations use “action” words as well, but we found that the DoD-level winners were more effective in doing so, particularly when they were able to point to more actions that occurred during the award period.

Clear Indication of Results: The winning nominations consistently indicated their results in clear, quantitative terms. Particularly when used with baseline figures, numerical results—numbers of dollars saved, gallons of water conserved, tons of

scrap recycled, etc.—can really show that an action has been effective. The winners generally used dates when describing their actions, too; this gave the reader a sense of sequence and showed that an action has been effective over time. DoD seems to value programs that use innovative approaches to solve problems efficiently and economically while preserving the environment. By showing how things improved within the award period, and providing quantitative data as proof, the winners, for the most part, met the DoD standards.

Program Breadth is Clear in the Format of the Nomination: Most of the winning nominations clearly followed the format for the *Accomplishments* section as listed under their respective category tabs in the DoD Guidance. The Army nominations did not do this as consistently. Our past analyses of DoD-level winners has revealed that adherence to the DoD-suggested format will not guarantee a DoD-level winner. However, such adherence does make information easier to find, and it makes it easier for the judges to see, in a single glance, whether or not all criteria area addressed. The winning nominations, which generally were stronger in program breadth than the Army nominations, made good use of this format in their submissions.

We strongly recommend that installations engage the support of their Public Affairs Office (PAO), or equivalent, as early as possible in the nomination process. Some installations do this and some do not. We feel it is extremely beneficial to have the PAO on the “team” from the beginning.

Questions may be directed to Joseph Ricci (410-436-1234) or Daniele Johnson (410-436-1653) at AEC.